



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/623,440	09/05/2000	Tsuyoshi Takagi	450108-02280 3925	
20999	7590 10/04/2004		EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG			WOZNIAK, JAMES S	
745 FIFTH A'NEW YORK,	AVENUE- 10TH FL.*  T. NY 10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TIEW TORKS,			2655	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/623,440	TAKAGI ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
,	James S. Wozniak	2655	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three motearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.5 sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate extending the final Office action; or	See MPEP te extension fee ttension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);	•	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 10-12</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Juan M SUSANIA	half
		SUSANIMO	

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/623,440

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Limitation regarding: Changing a transition probability by calculating a new transition probability according t transition probability equations wherein the transition probability is multiplied by an improvement ratio if the stimulus detected by a stimulus detection means is evaluated as being good and by a lowering ratio if the stimulus is evaluated as not being good.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's argument that Lund does not teach the ability to configure a behavioral model according to a probability automaton is not convincing. As is cited in the Final Rejection, Lund teaches the use of probability in selecting a behavior set (Behavior Set Selector, Page 1021). Thus, the previous rejection is maintained.